

Appl. No. 09/632,535
Amdt. Dated October 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 1, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 and 26-33 are pending in the present application. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being filed concurrently with this Amendment.

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed July 1, 2005. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-24 and 26-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants have canceled claims 31-34, and amended claims 1, 7-9, 14, 22, and 28. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Request for Examiner's Interview

1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the phone number listed below if after review, such claims are still not in condition for allowance. This telephone conference would greatly facilitate the examination of the present application. The undersigned attorney can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

2. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9, 10, 14-18, 22-24, 26, 28, 29, 31, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,643,663 issued to Dabney et al. ("Dabney") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,457,045 issued to Hanson et al. ("Hanson"); claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dabney in view of Hanson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702 issued to Plantz et al. ("Plantz"); and claims 11-13, 19-21, 27, 30, and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dabney in view of Hanson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,100,154 issued to Mullins ("Mullins").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and contend that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *MPEP* §2143, p. 2100-129

Appl. No. 09/632,535
Amdt. Dated October 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 1, 2005

(8th Ed., Rev. 2, May 2004). At a minimum, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Dabney, Hanson, Plantz, nor Mullins alone or in combination as discussed in the office action, teach or suggest deletion of the content as claimed.

Therefore, Applicants believe that independent claims 1, 14, 22, and 28 and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/632,535
Amdt. Dated October 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 1, 2005

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 3, 2005

By


William W. Schaal

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:


MAILING

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

FACSIMILE

☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and
Trademark Office.

Date: October 3, 2005


Tu Nguyen

October 3, 2005

Date